



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#110 / Argument
6-21-02
DJ

In re Patent Application of:)
THOMSON ET AL.)
Serial No. 09/658,509) Art Unit: 3375
Filing Date: SEPTEMBER 8, 2000) Examiner: C. KIM
For: BICYCLE STEM FOR ENLARGED) Attorney Docket No. 57012
HANDLEBAR PORTIONS AND)
ASSOCIATED METHODS)

AMENDMENT

Director, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JUN 19 2002
GROUP 360

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of May 2, 2002, please enter the remarks set out below.

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application. The Examiner has objected to Claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-27 because of the capitalization of "Claim". Applicants disagree with the Examiner and submit that it is not necessary to change "Claim" to "claim". "Claim" is merely being used as a proper noun.

The arguments supporting patentability of the present invention are found below.

I. The Double Patenting Rejection Is Improper

The Examiner also issued a non-statutory double patenting rejection of Claims 1-27. More particularly, the Examiner notes that the claims are unpatentable over Claims 1, 3, 15, 24, 27, 31, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43, and 45 of copending